

FARMINGTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, May 12, 2005

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION

Present: Chairman Cory Ritz, Commission Members Keith Klundt, Annie Hedberg, John Montgomery, Kevin Poff, Cindy Roybal, and Jim Talbot, City Planner David Petersen and Recording Secretary Jill Hedberg.

Chairman Ritz called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. **Cindy Roybal** offered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission approve the minutes of the April 28, 2005, Planning Commission Meeting with changes as noted. **Annie Hedberg** seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor.

REPORT OF CITY COUNCIL (Agenda Item #2)

David Petersen reported the proceedings of the City Council meeting which was held on May 4, 2005. He covered the following items:

- Cindy Morrow (139 East 400 North) was granted the appeal to modify one of the required conditions set by the Planning Commission on February 23, 2005, regarding the Conditional Use Permit for the construction of an attached garage. Condition #2 was eliminated. Conditions #1 and #3 would remain in affect.
- Conservancy lot size requirement for Lot 225 in Miller Meadows Subdivision was waived which would allow the lot to be under four acres.
- Exemption of Richmond Homes sales trailer at Farmington Ranches East was granted subject to outlined conditions and contingent upon the City Attorney's review of the Agreement.
- City Council Members had a discussion as to whether the Sign Ordinance should be revised in order to enhance economic development for businesses in the K-Mart complex. Council Members agreed that a committee should be created in order to do a comprehensive review of the sign ordinance to determine if changes were necessary.
- Council Members reviewed the proposed changes to the draft of the School District / Inter-local Agreement pertaining to the proposed Bus Compound at Glover's Lane. Paul Waite was informed that the Planning Commission was concerned about the students who were required to walk near the proposed Justice

Complex expansion. Mr. Waite took the issue seriously, stating that the children's safety is the District's main concern.

EV DEVELOPMENT, HARLEY AND JEAN EVANS - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE CORNERSTONE SUBDIVISION PLAT BY VACATING 3 LOTS AND A STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY (THE NORTH END OF WEST STREET NORTH OF EMERALD OAKS DRIVE) AND THEREAFTER CREATING 4 LOTS IN THE PLACE THEREOF (S-20-04) (Agenda Item #3)

Background Information

State law requires that the City Council review plat amendments within 45 days after a recommendation is received from the Planning Commission. The plat amendment proposed by Harley and Jean Evans also consists of a street vacation proposal. State law requires that notices for such street vacation requests require a notice posted in a newspaper of general circulation in the community once a week for four (4) consecutive weeks prior to the City Council hearing. The first notice for the street vacation will be posted on May 10th and the last notice on May 31st. Hence, the City Council will consider this item on June 1, 2005, along with the plat amendment. However, June 1st is forty-eight (48) days from the initial Planning Commission review on April 14th. Therefore, Staff is asking that the Planning Commission consider this agenda item one more time in order to "reset the clock."

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen informed the Commission Members that a deadline had been missed by three days so the timing would need to be reset.

Motion

Annie Hedberg moved that the Planning Commission affirm their decision of April 14, 2005. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

IVORY HOMES - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO AMEND THE FAIRWAYS OF OAKRIDGE SUBDIVISION PLAT BY COMBINING 6 LOTS INTO 3 LOTS (S-9-05) (Agenda Item #4)

Background Information

Ivory homes is proposing to consolidate lots #21 and #22 of the Fairways of Oakridge South PUD into one lot ("Lot 201"). The applicant is further requesting that lots #26 and #27, and lots #2 and #3 be combined to create "Lot 202" and "Lot 203" respectively.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Dave Petersen informed the Commission Members that Ivory Homes was submitting their request due to the required setbacks which made it difficult to build larger homes.

Jim Talbot confirmed with **Dave Petersen** that Lot 201 was the property being discussed, not Lot 210 which was referenced in packet material.

Cindy Roybal felt it would be an improvement to the neighborhood to have larger lots added.

Motion

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council amend the plat as requested. **Annie Hedberg** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- Fairways of Oakridge South PUD was an attractive subdivision which would benefit by larger lots.
- The subdivision would be completed sooner since there would be fewer lots to sale.
- The plat would not have major alterations from the plat already agreed upon by the City.

ROBERT AND NELL HOWELL (PUBLIC HEARING) - APPLICANTS ARE REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO TEACH SWIM LESSONS AT 1959 BELLA VISTA DRIVE IN AN LR-F ZONE (C-3-05) (Agenda Item #5)

Background Information

The applicants' daughter would like to teach swimming lessons in their private pool. She will teach approximately thirty students per week. The pool is currently under construction and will meet all safety requirements of the City, which include being surrounded by a 6' fence with no openings that a six-inch sphere can pass through, and all gates shall be equipped with self-closing and self-latching devices.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Dave Petersen stated a Conditional Use Permit was required because there would be more than eight students. He recommended granting the permit because of the large lots and the ample parking capacity in the driveway and on the street.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Anne Howell (1959 North Bella Vista Drive) advised the Commission Members that she had received the neighbors approval to conduct swimming lessons at their home. She said there was an open lot across the street which would be used to pick up and drop off students.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing and invited the Planning Commission to consider the issues.

Jim Talbot recommended adding a time limit to the Permit which would require the applicants to reapply after a certain period of time.

Anne Howell stated that she would only instruct 5-7 students per lesson. She did not think the students would walk to their lessons due to the hill near her home.

Chairman Ritz questioned whether appropriate insurance adjustments had been made.

Robert Howell stated that he had contacted his insurance carrier to make the necessary adjustments. He also stated that the pool was gated and had a retractable cover.

Motion

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission approve the application subject to the Farmington City ordinance requirements and the following conditions:

1. No more than 16 individuals may receive instruction at any one time.
2. The Farmington City Building Official shall inspect the facilities to ensure compliance with the International Building Code.
3. Documentation shall be provided to Farmington City that all instructors are certified.
4. The Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a three year period, at which time a new application shall be necessary in order to continue operating the business.

Cindy Roybal seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- Swimming lessons would be an asset to the neighborhood.
- Applicant had taken the necessary precautions: neighbors had been advised, adequate parking available, safety issues addressed.
- Complies with Section 11-8-105.

LORENE PALMER (PUBLIC HEARING) - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL FOR HOME OCCUPATION IN A DETACHED BUILDING ("IVY CANDLE COMPANY") LOCATED AT 552 SOUTH 1025 WEST IN AN AE ZONE (C-4-05) (Agenda Item #6)

Background Information

The applicant has purchased a candle manufacturing business that has been operated in Farmington as a home occupation for a number of years. It will be located in an unattached garage on the property. She will be manufacturing and wholesaling candles.

There will be no additional traffic generated by the business. The materials are not considered hazardous by the fire chief. Wax will be heated on a stove in the garage, poured into molds and perfumes will be added to the candles. There will be no additional employees.

The business will occupy the same building as Beehive Hotrods LLC which is operating under Conditional Use Permit #C-13-04.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

Dave Petersen said the applicants purchased the candle company from another Farmington resident and that the company would be run in the same unattached accessory building as Beehive Hotrods, which the City approved last year at the same location. City Staff recommended granting the application subject to the Farmington City ordinance requirements.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Planning Commission.

Lorene Palmer (552 South 1025 West) said she purchased the Ivy Candle Company from Lisa Alexander who owned the company for eight years. She would be occupying a 10 x 20 foot room in the unattached garage to make the candles. There would not be any traffic generated from the business because it was strictly wholesale.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing and invited the Planning Commission to consider the issues.

Cindy Roybal asked if the fire chief had visited their property.

Mrs. Palmer said the fire chief had not seen their property.

Dave Petersen said Ken Klinker had questioned the fire chief as to the hazards that could exist from the candle company. The fire chief did not consider the materials used to be hazardous.

Jim Talbot thought it was a benefit that the candle company would be in a structure that was not attached to the applicant's primary residence.

Keith Klundt asked the applicant what types of equipment would be used to heat the materials.

Lorene Palmer said she would use double boilers, pans and a stove.

Motion

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission grant the application subject to the Farmington City ordinance requirements. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Findings

- There would be a value to the property owner without being a detriment to the neighbors.
- The Conditional Use Permit would be in compliance with City ordinances.
- There would not be additional traffic generated.

DONNA TYTECA AND RANDY HINDS (PUBLIC HEARING) - APPLICANTS ARE REQUESTING CONDITIONAL USE AND SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR A TWO-FAMILY DWELLING AT 422 SOUTH 200 EAST IN AN LR ZONE (C-5-05) (Agenda Item #7)

Background Information

The applicant proposes to convert an existing single-family dwelling into a two-family

dwelling. The property is located on the southwest corner of 200 East and 400 South. The single-family dwelling fronts 200 East. There is a drop in elevation from the front of the property to the western boundary creating a walk-out basement for the dwelling. It is proposed that the upper floor will be one dwelling unit with access on an existing driveway to 200 East and the basement will consist of the other dwelling unit with access via a driveway to 400 South. Four (4) parking spaces are required. The applicant is proposing the two (2) spaces for the upper unit will be on the existing slab which leads to 200 East. The applicant is proposing the occupant for the lower unit will have a space in a proposed garage or carport and an additional space in the driveway. It is suggested that all designated parking areas be paved. Section 11-28-180(a)(8) states:

“All dwellings shall be provided with a garage or carport having a minimum interior width of 12 feet, constructed concurrently with the dwelling and in accordance with the Uniform Building Code as adopted and amended by the City.”

The existing single-family dwelling is clearly a non-conforming building because it does not have a garage or carport. The proposed garage or carport for the lower unit may bring the entire dwelling closer to conformity with City ordinances. Nevertheless, all conditional uses shall be compatible with character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding neighborhoods, and other existing and proposed development. A two-family dwelling now exists at approximately 370 South 200 East. This dwelling has a garage for each dwelling unit. In order to have the subject project be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and properties, the Planning Commission may wish to consider requiring the applicant to provide covered parking for the upper dwelling unit as well.

Conditional use standards are set forth in Section 11-8-105 of the Zoning Ordinance. Paragraph 6 of this section states in part:

“Such uses shall not under the circumstances of the particular case be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity.”

The location of the project is adjacent to a busy State right-of-way and it is anticipated that traffic will increase on this road in the future. The driveway for the upper unit should be re-configured to allow vehicles to enter traffic moving forward instead of backward.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen said the existing single-family dwelling was located at 422 South 200 East in an LR zone near Woodland Park. The applicant requested a Conditional Use and site plan approval to convert the property into a two-family dwelling. It was proposed that there be an upstairs unit and a downstairs unit which would each have its own entrance. The applicant would only provide covered parking for the basement unit with a future driveway to access 400 South. **Mr. Petersen** informed the Commission Members that all new developments on major

collector streets were required to arrange their access in such a way as to allow vehicles to enter traffic moving forward instead of backward. He reminded the Commission Members of their different motion alternatives stating that the request could be denied. The motion could also be tabled which would allow for the following to occur:

- The applicant would be able to submit plans that were more legible.
- Future elevations could be submitted to portray how the rear covered parking would look. **Mr. Petersen** thought covered parking should be provided for both units since Farmington City's standard is for all dwellings to have covered parking.
- The applicant would be able to reconfigure the upper driveway.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Chuck Richards (464 South 450 East) stated that he had offered to purchase the property contingent upon receiving a Conditional Use Permit. He did not intend to provide the upstairs unit with a carport.

Albert Whipple (164 East Paracle Circle) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission from residents located near the subject property. He read the letter which included the following concerns:

- The addition of the required parking on the west of the property on such a small lot would greatly reduce the yard. Occupants would be forced to use the front and side yards in such a way as to detract from the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Small children may be enticed to play in the front yard facing 200 East.
- It would be unsafe for vehicles to back onto 200 East.
- The addition of a carport or garage directly to the west side of the dwelling would violate the Uniform Building Code egress requirements. Building the parking to meet the code requirements may violate the side yard setback requirements.
- The required parking area to the west of the existing house would add an additional curb cut near the intersection on 400 South which would greatly reduce the vehicle safety in the area.
- The added curb cut would also reduce the space for on-street parking fronting their property which would force any visitors to park in front of someone else's home.
- Significant modifications to the exterior of the structure would be required to meet the current codes.

Concerns expressed by the Planning Commission Staff were also shared by the surrounding residents.

[7:45 - **Kevin Poff** arrived]

Mr. Whipple informed the Planning Commission that a two-family dwelling would require a fire separation that would be a detriment to the structure.

Scott Johnson (142 East Paracle Circle) said his main concern was that a two-family dwelling would be out of character for the area. He did not feel the modifications would be in character with the neighborhood and most of the yard would be eliminated.

Mr. Richards said he did not intend to ruin the neighborhood. The carport would replace the existing porch. He requested to table the decision so he could review the comments and submit a proposal.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing and invited the Planning Commission to consider the issues.

Jim Talbot stated that a duplex in a traditional neighborhood is out of character. He felt safety was jeopardized when vehicles back out onto 200 East.

Keith Klundt was in favor of tabling the decision in order for Mr. Richards to respond to the issue of the driveway on 200 East. He thought the improvements described by **Mr. Richards** would be an improvement to the property.

Cindy Roybal thought it would enhance the structure by adding a carport or garage to the front of the property. She felt the property should enhance the quality of the neighborhood rather than detract from it. She would be willing to table the decision in order for **Mr. Richards** to respond to the neighbor's concerns.

Annie Hedberg requested different elevations be submitted.

Chairman Ritz said the letter from the neighbors had excellent points and said it raised more concerns than he already had. He questioned whether the proposal could really be fulfilled but was willing to consider tabling the issue.

Cindy Roybal suggested the applicant create a circular drive on the front of the house so vehicles could enter the road in the forward direction, which was required on all new developments.

David Petersen suggested Commission Members consider the precedent this application could set. Other home owners on 200 East might want to convert their homes to two-family dwellings as well.

Motion

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission table the decision until the following issues were resolved:

1. The applicant must provide a legible site plan meeting standards set forth in Section 11-7-105 of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The applicant must provide proposed future elevations of the two-family dwelling for review by the Planning Commission. These elevations should include, among other things, a garage or carport for the upper dwelling unit and drawings showing proposed materials for the exterior walls of the two-family dwelling.
3. The site plan must be updated to show a new driveway configuration for the upper unit which would allow vehicles to enter traffic moving forward instead of backward.
4. Submit proposal to the appropriate City Staff and Engineers to ensure all code requirements were met.

Keith Klundt seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Whipple asked that he receive copies of documents submitted by **Mr. Richards**. He said that there were residents within 300 feet of the property who had not received notification of the hearing.

David Petersen stated that a computer generated a list of the residents who were within 300 feet of the property. All residents on the list received notification.

LANDFORM L.L.C. (PUBLIC HEARING) - APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION TO ANNEX 5.262 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 1450 NORTH 1800 WEST (A-1-05) (Agenda Item #8).

Background Information

The subject property is located within the City's expansion area and should be annexed into Farmington City. However, the applicant would like to present a schematic subdivision plan for the property and request a recommendation regarding a zone designation at a public hearing before the Planning Commission on May 26, 2005.

END OF PACKET MATERIAL.

David Petersen stated that the City Council passed a resolution to accept for study the subject Annexation Petition. The applicant decided to add 15' to the eastern neighbor which started the process over again. The applicant wished to answer questions the Planning Commission might have, but he was not able to attend. The public hearing would be rescheduled for May 26, 2005. Residents within 300' of the property would receive notification of the new date.

Public Hearing

Chairman Ritz opened the meeting to a public hearing and invited the public to address the Commission.

David Byrd (Landform L.L.C. representative) stated that he did not think the annexation would be a major ordeal.

David Petersen stated that the applicant had to get a signature from the adjoining property owner.

David Byrd stated that adding 15' was beneficial to the configuration of the lots. The applicant's brother who owns the adjoining property was not ready to develop his entire parcel.

Cindy Roybal asked **Mr. Byrd** if he was representing Ivory Homes.

Mr. Byrd stated that he represented Frank Ivory who owns Landform L.L.C. Frank Ivory is the son of Ellis Ivory. Ivory Homes is the proposed home builder.

Public Hearing Closed

With no further comments, **Chairman Ritz** closed the public hearing and invited the Planning Commission to consider the issues.

Motion

Annie Hedberg moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council annex the area as proposed and to further zone the property A if an acceptable schematic plan was not reviewed and approved by the City. **Keith Klundt** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

FARMINGTON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY AND FARMINGTON CITY COUNCIL - APPLICANTS ARE REQUESTING A RECOMMENDATION REGARDING A DRAFT PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT PLAN ENTITLED “STATION PARK REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA PLAN” (M-4-05) (Agenda Item #9).

Dave Petersen stated the Redevelopment Agency was asking the Planning Commission to determine whether the draft proposed Plan was found to be consistent with the City’s General Plan, the City plans for the development of the area and the Capital Facility Plan of the City. The Planning Commission Chairman would sign Exhibit “D” - Report of Planning Commission if the draft proposed Plan were acceptable. He informed the Commission Members that the TMU land designation was zoned agricultural except for a remnant of UDOT property and the City Shop site. He referred to the Station Park Redevelopment Project Area Plan - Draft Project Area Plan dated April 1, 2005, stating that there were items inserted by the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) which needed to be there by statute. The RDA was requesting the Planning Commission determine whether the Plan complied with the Transportation Mixed Use development. He read a portion of Section 4 (A):

Section 4 Certain Project Area Characteristics and How They Will Be Affected By the Redevelopment

A. General Statement of Land Uses in the Project Area

The permitted land uses within the Redevelopment Project Area shall be those uses permitted by the officially adopted zoning ordinances of the City, as those ordinances may be amended from time to time, subject to limitations imposed by “overlay” restrictions and the controls and guidelines of this Redevelopment Plan. A Land Use/ Zoning Map showing the current permitted uses is included in this Redevelopment Plan as Exhibit “B” and is made a part of this Plan.

The existing uses of the Project Area are: industrial, residential, and agricultural.

The City's General Plan was amended on July 7, 2004 to provide for the Transportation Mixed Use Area (including the Project Area) with the intent of having the general land areas and their related uses complement and support a Transportation Mixed Use development. As noted above, the Project Area is not yet zoned Transit Oriented Development (TOD). It is expected that the currently permitted land uses in the Project Area may be changed for purposes of effecting the redevelopment of this Project Area, however, this is expected to occur through the normal zoning process upon receipt of requests for zoning change applications from property owners. The City may or may not determine to propose zoning ordinance amendments in order to aid in or promote redevelopment or for other reasons.

The TOD Zoning Ordinance has been established to allow for the zoning of the Project Area to be changed after receipt of appropriate applications and after following all required public process. A TOD zoning classification for the Project Area would compliment and encourage a sustainable Project Area that would assist the City in eliminating blight from the project Area.

It is expected that the current uses for the Project Area will be directly affected by redevelopment of the Project Area as follows: Industrial, detached single-family residential, and agricultural uses will decrease as the Project Area is developed with mixed uses, including commercial, office, retail and multi-family residential uses. It is expected that much of the vacant land constituting the Project Area will be developed through the construction of class "A" office space, retail and related space and/or services (including but not limited to, entertainment, restaurants, and related services), commercial, hotel and/or motel uses, residential units including those to be owned and/or rented, and other transportation oriented uses as contemplated under the City's General Plan.

Dave Petersen informed the Planning Commission Members that there were other sections of the Project Area Plan that should be reviewed to verify they were in accordance with the City's General Plan.

Commission Members questioned who had drafted the Station Park Redevelopment Plan. They were informed that it was the Redevelopment Agency's Attorney.

Chairman Ritz questioned whether the development was supposed to be limited to 100 acres.

Commission Members had questions they wanted answered before signing the recommendation.

David Petersen suggested **Kevin Poff** and **Keith Klundt** meet with himself and **Max Forbush** in order to address issues that the Planning Commission had.

Commission Members were concerned that the developer had not submitted a request to rezone. They were also concerned about the amount of money and effort that the City had put into the project without having tenants secured.

Dave Petersen replied that the developer was attempting to secure tenants before asking for the rezone in order to avoid higher taxes. It was believed that the construction of the infrastructure would attract additional tenants.

David Petersen said the RDA was pursuing the improvement of a commuter rail site by utilizing RDA bonds. He said the developer was supposed to announce a new tenant on May 23, 2005.

Jim Talbot said he was in favor of Cory signing the acceptance letter once questions were answered by **Max Forbush**.

Chairman Ritz reminded the Commission Members that they were only asked to verify that Farmington's ordinances were represented.

Kevin Poff felt it was difficult to vote in favor of something that he did not completely understand. He questioned items such as the Capital Facilities Plan, the condemnation process, the implementation of redevelopment projects, the right to demolish, developer's reimbursement for improvements, revenue projections, reserve fund for bonds, tax increment extensions, and provisions for amending the Redevelopment Plan.

Dave Petersen and other Commission Members explained all of the items.

Jim Talbot stated that City officials, developers and committees have to be trusted. Eventually, the City and the developer will get their investment back from the tax base.

[John Montgomery arrived at 8:45 P.M.]

Cindy Roybal asked who comprised the tax entity.

David Petersen said the TEC was made up of two school district representatives, two County representatives, two City representatives, one State Board of Education representative, and one person representing the remaining special districts in the area.

Keith Klundt stated the Taxing Entity Committee could determine which improvements the City was obligated to make and which improvements existed due to the development.

John Montgomery asked which projects the RDA had undertaken.

Commission Members responded that the RDA had established a redevelopment area in the vicinity of the K-Mart complex and that the RDA had established a redevelopment area in central Farmington in response to the need for a downtown grocery store and other improvements.

Planning Commission Members agreed that the draft was in accordance with the City's Master Plan.

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission authorize **Chairman Ritz** to sign the letter informing the Redevelopment Agency that the Planning Commission had reviewed the draft and found it to be consistent with the City's General Plan, the City plans for the development of the area and the Capital Facility Plan of the City. **Annie Hedberg** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

MASTER TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION - HORROCKS ENGINEERS (Agenda Item #10).

David Petersen informed the Planning Commission Members that the City Council would be holding a Special Meeting on May 17, 2005, at 6:00 P.M. at the Farmington City Hall. The City Council would like to have the Planning Commission's recommendations regarding the Master Transportation Plan. **Mr. Petersen** handed out a list he had created from his personal notes, comments from Planning Commission members and minutes from previous Planning Commission Meetings. The pros and cons to each issue was included as follows:

BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT):

Goals:

- A. Must serve downtown;
- B. Must serve Lagoon; and
- C. Must accommodate an extension to the north-end of the County someday.

Alternatives:

1. Frontage Road Alignment. BRT with traffic, queue-jumpers at four-way stops and/or signalized intersections.

Pro:

- More room for Park & Ride lots
- Space is available for a dedicated lane in the future

- Less impact to residences
- Less vehicle/BRT conflicts, hence greater speed for BRT

Con:

- Poor continuity to downtown
- Greater impact to west State Street
- Within walking distance to fewer dwellings
- Does not avoid schools until a continuous Frontage Road is created (but this bypasses downtown)
- Poor continuity with Centerville connection

2. 200 East Alignment. BRT with traffic, queue-jumpers at four-way stops and/or signalized intersections.

Pro:

- Good continuity to downtown
- Less impact to west State Street
- Within walking distance to more dwellings
- Avoids schools whether or not a continuous Frontage Road is created

Con:

- Less room for Park & Ride lots
- Little to no space is available for a dedicated lane in the future without disruption to neighborhoods
- Greater impact to residences
- Greater vehicle/BRT conflicts, hence potentially less speed for BRT

3. Select a “preferred route” but do not implement BRT until BRT is extended to the north.

- 3a. Limit BRT to summer only?

Other

- A. Further Study:

1. How critical is downtown? And will it be more or less critical as time goes by?
2. When will BRT come on line? How close does this coincide with construction for a continuous Frontage Road?
3. Is Centerville’s preferred alignment SR 106?

- B. Do not let BRT issues hold up the rest of the Master Transportation Plan (MTP). If the rest of the MTP is ready to go and the BRT portion is not, add the BRT elements later.

Jim Talbot suggested the entity provide a shuttle to access downtown. It would be less expensive than reconstructing roads.

Dave Petersen showed population and commercial growth projections.

John Montgomery asked if the opportunity for BRT would be lost if it were not constructed in the beginning.

David Petersen said BRT could be an option at a later time.

Commission Members expressed concern about 200 East becoming a dedicated lane and questioned whether it would be possible to have a dedicated lane that was painted instead of curbed.

David Petersen responded that it would be possible to have a dedicated lane without parking on 200 East.

Chairman Ritz stated that 200 East residents would not be able to have company due to lack of parking.

Jim Talbot said residents are going to adjust to the commuter rail concept. He felt the best alternative would be the frontage road because fewer people would be impacted. This alternative would also leave ground available to be purchased.

Annie Hedberg agreed that the Frontage Road would be the best option but that it would impact the Frontage Road residents. She suggested they receive an opportunity to share their input. She felt they were exposed to a number of transportation issues including the train, the freeway and commuter rail.

Cindy Roybal stated that she would like to detour from 200 East as soon as possible.

Kevin Poff questioned how BRT would be incorporated into regular traffic if it was supposed to move faster than regular traffic. He suggested creating a dedicated lane so it could still progress in the event of traffic congestion.

Commission Members agreed they were in favor of the Frontage Road Alignment but suggested additional studies be done and more questions should be answered as set forth in the outline. They also agreed that the Transportation Plan should be adopted even if a recommendation regarding BRT was not ready.

WEST STATE STREET/SOUTH INTERCHANGE.

Note:

Some members of the public stated that a reconfiguration of the West State Street/ South Interchange area represents a huge cost to the tax payer. However, it should be noted that these areas will be reconstructed whether or not the current road configuration changes. The State Street over pass will be rebuilt when construction starts on the Legacy Highway, and the south Farmington / 200 West Interchange will be rebuilt when I-15 is widened to include a 5th lane.

Alternatives:

1. Create a continuous Frontage Road.

Pro:

- Traffic is reduced in front of the schools and the City park
(Less west Farmington traffic, less congested freeway over-spill traffic)
- Traffic is reduced in the west State Street neighborhood
(Less west Farmington traffic, less congested freeway over-spill traffic)
- The UDOT frontage road N/A Line may be removed
- More land becomes available for development (improves tax base)
- May accommodate a potential future Frontage Road BRT alignment with less impact to schools and residences

Con:

- Lagoon must rethink their parking
- It is likely that the direct Freeway connection to the Lagoon entrance will be modified

2. Keep the same configuration.

Pro:

- It is likely that Lagoon will continue to use the public right-of-way for their queue
- A direct Freeway connection to Lagoon is maintained

Con:

- Traffic will increase in front of the schools and City park
(More west Farmington traffic, congested freeway over-spill traffic)
- Traffic will increase in the west State Street neighborhood
(More west Farmington traffic, congested freeway over-spill traffic)
- The UDOT frontage road N/A Line will probably not be removed
- Potentially more land does not become available for development
- May not accommodate a potential future Frontage Road BRT alignment
with less impact to schools and residences

Chairman Ritz questioned whether BRT would be able to have a dedicated lane in conjunction with Legacy Highway.

John Montgomery and **Dave Petersen** agreed it could be a possibility.

Commission Members were in favor of creating a continuous Frontage Road.

NORTH MAIN

■ **Somerset/Main**

It must be improved. Improvements should include but not be limited to a traffic light, roundabout, road alignment and grade modifications to increase site and stopping distances, etc.

■ **Frontage Road Access**

Yes, if UDOT will allow it, but safety must be foremost in any decision. Deceleration or acceleration lanes will likely be necessary.

■ **1400 North/Main**

Further study is needed. Something should be done to increase safety at this intersection.

■ **Main/Northridge Road Intersection**

Note:

- a. Most seemed to agree that whatever decision is made that a visual model of the traffic control alternatives should be presented to the Commission.
- b. An action to close or block Mountain Road to prevent Fruit Heights traffic entering Farmington City is very unlikely

Alternatives:

1. Stop Sign

Pro:

- Sometimes inaction is the best action
(Risk: The City may lose potential funding for another traffic control option that may be available in conjunction with the development of the Leonard/Potter properties)
- Inexpensive
- Some said safe for pedestrians (others were not so sure)

Con:

- Over the years traffic will continue to back up and drivers may take alternative routes through neighborhoods
- Unsafe – over the years traffic will continue to back up and drivers may execute risky decisions to enter traffic
- Unsafe for pedestrians unless special pedestrian measures are implemented such as crossing lights, flags, etc.
- Traffic Calming: Traffic will continue to run through the Main Street let of the intersection at high-speeds during certain intervals of the day
- Some said unsafe for pedestrians (others were not so sure)

3. Traffic Light: not feasible because it is too close to the light at the Cherry Hill interchange.

4. Roundabout

Pro:

- Fewer traffic back up problems. Drivers may not take alternate routes through neighborhoods
- Traffic Calming: Traffic will not run through the Main Street leg of the intersection at high-speeds during certain intervals of the day
- Some said safe for pedestrians (others were not so sure)

Con:

- Some were against roundabouts. Comments included, among other things: they are confusing and difficult to understand, and teenagers like to race around them.
- Some said unsafe for pedestrians (others were not so sure)

Dave Petersen stated that Horrocks Engineering preferred a traffic light rather than a roundabout for the Somerset/Main intersection. They were working on a visual model of the traffic control alternatives.

The Planning Commission was in favor of the first three points set forth in the outline. For the Somerset intersection, the Commission Members favored a traffic light. The Planning Commission members stated they were in favor of roundabouts that could have the pedestrian crossing further down the road. The island would be extended so there would be a safety point in the middle. All Commission Members agreed that safety should be the highest priority in any decision made. The Commission also wanted to see a visual model of the alternatives at Main Street and Northridge Road.

NORTHWEST FARMINGTON

Decision Tree

1. Provide for Legacy North?

Planning Commission Response: Yes, Park Lane interchange cannot fail.

2. Provide a “Western Major Collector?”

Commission Members felt this was the only alternative but expressed concern for the Burke Lane residents.

3. Provide a minor collector on Burke Lane across UTA tracks

Planning Commission Response: Yes. It will provide a second way out to Park Lane for residents in northwest Farmington. It will distribute traffic more evenly on the west side.

Kevin Poff asked if it would be a possibility to provide North to South access under the Legacy North freeway.

Dave Petersen stated that this alternative may negatively impact existing ponds and wetlands, but said he would ask UDOT to research the possibility because they are currently conducting a Legacy North corridor preservation study.

Annie Hedberg stated that the minor collector road on Burke Lane across the UTA tracks would be paid for by three developers.

SOUTHWEST FARMINGTON MAJOR COLLECTOR ALTERNATIVES

1. Reserve both the 650 West and the “Cattle” Road as major collectors leading south to Centerville. This will provide 2 more north to south bound routes in addition to I-15, Legacy Highway, Frontage Road, and SR 106 (200 East).

- 2.. Explore utilizing land near the UTA tracks as an alignment for a major collector. If it proves to be unfeasible due to such things as the County or the other property owners unable to dedicate right-of-way, or for other reasons such as environmental constraints, then stay with the 1100 West alignment.

Planning Commission Members agreed they were in favor of providing a Western Major Collector on the “Cattle” Road in addition to the major collector already planned for the extension of 650 West south of Glover Lane.

Jim Talbot moved that the Planning Commission continue their Meeting past 10:00 P.M. **Annie Hedberg** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Dave Petersen distributed a handout which contained answers from Horrocks Engineers in response to questions that arose at the Master Transportation Plan Public Hearing.

MISCELLANEOUS (Agenda Item #11).

Tom Stuart Development Discussion

Dave Petersen stated that Tom Stuart wanted to develop the old proposed DMV site which was over an acre. He would need to come before the Planning Commission on a different date to apply for a Conditional Use Permit.

Tom Stuart stated his plans to develop the DMV site by the Jr. High School. The DMV had three drive up lanes. He intended to use the existing building plan which he had previously submitted to the Planning Commission. The proposed buyer/tenant was iTransact, Inc., a company which processes credit card transactions over the internet creating more security for internet users. There were a total of 91 stalls on the old DMV site plan. iTransact, Inc. would need 20 stalls. **Mr. Stuart** requested the Planning Commission’s input as to whether it was a project he should pursue.

Mr. Summsion, a representative for iTransact, Inc. stated their current location was in Bountiful. The only traffic at their location was from their 18 employees. He stated the location would not be a retail facility. He estimated iTransact would grow slowly, only adding a few employees in the next few years.

Commission Members asked the square footage of the building and questioned whether iTransact would be the only tenant.

Tom Stuart said the building would be 10,000 total square feet. iTransact would utilize 6,000 square feet and would sublet the remaining space.

Commission Members agreed that the building would require more than 25 parking stalls.

Chairman Ritz asked if there would be a wetlands impact.

Mr. Stuart said that there is at least .25 acres of wetland on the property. He said the issue had already been approved and mitigated.

The Planning Commission advised **Mr. Stuart** that they did not think the proposed building blended with the existing buildings in the area due to it's flat roof but suggested he go ahead with the proposal as planned.

Garbett Homes Sign Issues

Dave Petersen informed the Planning Commission that he had misplaced information that was needed for the Garbett Homes sign package.

Annie Hedberg informed **Mr. Petersen** that she had copies of the information that was needed.

Proposed Deli - 48 North 100 East

Dave Petersen informed Commission Members that commercial use issues could not be handled by Staff unless the Planning Commission had delegated the assignment. The owner of the proposed deli (48 North 100 East) had an agreement with Arnie of Arnie's Barber Shop as to where their dumpster should be located. The deli owners proposed constructing a wall in order to keep the dumpster out of sight.

The deli owners discussed possible dumpster locations with the Commission Members. They agreed a block wall would be more attractive than a vinyl fence, although it would be more costly.

Dave Petersen suggested the issue of the easement be researched so the dumpster could remain near the deli exit.

Kevin Poff moved to delegate the dumpster issue to staff allowing **Dave Petersen** the final discretion as to what kind of block should be utilized. **Annie Hedberg** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

Neighborhood Mixed Use

Dave Petersen recommended the Planning Commission hold a study session in order to prepare for the Neighborhood Mixed Use Public Hearing which would be held on May 26, 2005.

The study session would be held on Wednesday, May 18, 2005 at 6:30 P.M.

Cindy Roybal moved that the Planning Commission hold a study session on May 18, 2005 at 6:30 P.M. in order to prepare for the Neighborhood Mixed Use Public Hearing on May 26, 2005. **Jim Talbot** seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

Keith Klundt moved that the Planning Commission adjourn at 10:43 P.M.

Cory Ritz, Chairman
Farmington City Planning Commission